EXPERT REPORT OF VICTOR J. BIERMAN, JR.

State of Oklahoma, et al., Plaintiffs Tyson Foods, Inc., et al., Defendants

Case No. 05-CV-0329-GKF-SAJ

United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma

January 23, 2009

Victor J. Bierman, Jr., Ph.D. **Senior Scientist**

January 23, 2009

OPINIONS AND SUPPORTING STATEMENTS ON EXPERT REPORT BY DR. BERNARD ENGEL

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2008) has issued official guidance on the development, evaluation and application of environmental models. Model evaluation provides information to determine when a model, despite its uncertainties, can be appropriately used to inform an environmental decision. It addresses the appropriateness of a model for a given application, the soundness of the underlying science, the quality and quantity of available data, and the degree to which model results correspond to observations.

Model evaluation includes model corroboration, and sensitivity and uncertainty analyses. This EPA guidance defines model corroboration as quantitative and qualitative methods for evaluating the degree to which a model corresponds to reality. In practical terms, it is the process of "confronting models with data." In some disciplines, this process has been referred to as validation. EPA prefers the term "corroboration" because it implies a claim of usefulness and not truth. Calibration is part of the corroboration process and involves adjusting model parameters until model predictions give the best fit to observed data. Sensitivity and uncertainty analyses investigate how model outputs are affected by changes in selected model inputs.

My expert report begins by addressing the soundness of the underlying science in the models developed by Dr. Engel and the appropriateness of these models for the IRW and the opinions he puts forth. Next it addresses the quality and quantity of the available data, and how these data were used by Dr. Engel to apply his models. Finally it addresses the degree to which the results of Dr. Engel's models correspond to reality. Throughout my report I set forth my opinions on Dr. Engel's methods, results and claims.

1. The entire construct put forth by Dr. Engel is fundamentally flawed. His modeling framework is conceptually flawed and not appropriate for the IRW.

<u>Supporting Statement 1a:</u> The phosphorus mass balance in Dr. Engel's expert report is an inappropriate construct and is not relevant to the relationship between phosphorus sources and water quality.

The phosphorus mass balance in Appendix B of Dr. Engel's expert report is an inappropriate construct that is irrelevant to water quality impacts in IRW streams and rivers, and in Lake Tenkiller. Conceptually, Dr. Engel encased the entire IRW, including all of the air, land and water compartments, in a "bubble" and considered only the phosphorus movements into and out of this "bubble." These phosphorus movements are irrelevant to water quality impacts in the IRW. The only phosphorus movements that are relevant are those that occur inside this "bubble" from land to water or from atmosphere to water.

The mass balance conducted by Dr. Engel completely ignores movement (or delivery) of phosphorus loads from any land-based sources within the IRW to streams and rivers or to Lake

Tenkiller. His analysis does not tell us how much phosphorus reaches the water or how much reaches the lake, and it does not account for WWTP discharges or septic system releases.

On Page 32 of his expert report, Dr. Engel states that poultry production within the IRW is currently responsible for more than 76 percent of the net annual phosphorus additions to the IRW. This claim is based on Dr. Engel's phosphorus mass balance and is a completely misleading representation of the relative contribution of poultry litter phosphorus to water quality impacts in the IRW.

Dr. Engel's mass balance does not consider a "starting point" for phosphorus in the IRW because it includes only sources and sinks of phosphorus, not reservoirs of phosphorus already present. Table 11 in Appendix B of Dr. Engel's expert report indicates that phosphorus additions to the IRW from poultry were 4,642 tons in 2002. From materials produced by Dr. Engel, the total phosphorus mass in the IRW soil in his GLEAMS model is 6,370,998 tons. This reservoir represents the sum of phosphorus mass for actual conditions (1997-2006) in all soil horizons (layers) in his GLEAMS model. The bottom depths of these soil horizons range from 15.24 to 83.93 inches, depending on location.

Consequently, the annual phosphorus addition to the IRW from poultry litter represents less than 0.07 percent of the total phosphorus mass already present in the soil of the IRW, as represented in Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model. This phosphorus mass reservoir of 6,370,998 tons is not accounted for in the phosphorus mass balance that Dr. Engel conducted.

<u>Supporting Statement 1b:</u> The GLEAMS model used by Dr. Engel is an inappropriate tool for predicting watershed-scale nonpoint source phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW.

GLEAMS (Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems) was developed to simulate edge-of-field and bottom-of-root zone loadings of water, sediment, pesticides and plant nutrients from agricultural fields. GLEAMS is a field-scale model and operates at daily time scales. Dr. Engel inappropriately used GLEAMS to predict watershed-scale nonpoint source phosphorus loads from the land to streams and rivers for the entire IRW. In addition, he used GLEAMS for the IRW despite its limitations and uncertainties for predicting phosphorus loads that he identified in his own previous work, as discussed below.

In a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report entitled, "TMDL Model Evaluation and Research Needs," Shoemaker et al. (2005) describe GLEAMS as a continuous simulation, field-scale model that assumes that a field has homogenous land use, soils and precipitation. They characterize GLEAMS as an edge-of-field model that has a low level of support for watersheds and no support for receiving waters.

Shoemaker et al. (2005) specifically state three limitations for use of the GLEAMS model:

- Limited to an agricultural field of very small size
- Not suited for bigger watersheds
- Not suited for urban land uses.

<u>Supporting Statement 2e:</u> Most of the inputs for Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model are default or generic values and are not based on conditions in the IRW.

Model outputs cannot be accurate and reliable unless the model inputs represent real-world conditions in the system being modeled. In other words, garbage in equals garbage out. Most of the inputs used by Dr. Engel for his GLEAMS model were default or generic values that were not based on data for the IRW, nor were they shown to reasonably represent conditions in the IRW. This calls into question the accuracy and reliability of his model predictions for nonpoint source phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW.

There are several ways in which a GLEAMS model user can provide plant nutrient input parameters for a particular application. Two examples of such parameters would be CLAB (labile phosphorus concentration in the soil horizon) and RATE (rate of application of animal waste). First, the GLEAMS model itself can provide its own plant nutrient input parameters. For example, if a user provides their own input value for CLAB, GLEAMS can distribute this value into the appropriate computational layers. If soil nutrient data are available for local soils the user should input those values, but if such data are not available, generalized estimates can be generated by GLEAMS itself.

Second, GLEAMS contains a default database for plant nutrient input parameters that represents data compiled from a number of sources and locations. This database is not specific to the IRW. The GLEAMS user can decide whether to use actual data for local soils or the default data base contained in GLEAMS.

Third, as a starting point for a site-specific application, a GLEAMS user could simply decide to use plant nutrient input parameters from the several example tables in the appendices to the GLEAMS Manual (Knisel and Davis 2000). These values could be from the default database in GLEAMS, generalized estimates generated by GLEAMS, or from other sources. Again, these values are not specific to the IRW.

I will use the term "default" to refer to the default values in the GLEAMS database and the generalized estimates generated by the GLEAMS model itself. I will use the term "generic" to refer to values taken directly from one of the example tables in the appendices to the GLEAMS Manual.

The U.S. EPA (2008) guidance on environmental models is clear on the importance of using real-world data for model inputs. On Page 16 it states, "The most appropriate data ... should always be selected for use in modeling analyses. Whenever possible, all parameters should be directly measured in the system of interest." On Page 19 it states, "Even though a modeling framework (or system of equations) might be technically sound, a particular site-specific application of the modeling framework may still be highly uncertain if the data used to construct the application are limited in quantity or quality. For such an application, the model would not have the necessary scientific credibility or utility to support an environmental decision."

On Page 137 of the GLEAMS Manual (Knisel and Davis 2000) in the section on "Nutrient Parameters Description," it states that, "The plant nutrient component of GLEAMS and the associated parameter values allow the user to make a generalized application with model-initialized parameters or very site-specific detailed user-defined initialization." The claims and opinions put forth by Dr. Engel in his expert report on phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller, and

on which phosphorus loads come from which land uses, are not generalized but are intended to be specific to the IRW. These claims cannot be supported with a generalized application of GLEAMS, but must be supported with site-specific data that reflect real-world conditions in the IRW.

Most of values used by Dr. Engel for his GLEAMS nutrient parameter input files were default or generic values, not values based on any actual data from the IRW. In his expert report, Dr. Engel did not describe any investigations he conducted to determine whether these default or generic values were appropriate for the IRW. This calls into question the accuracy and reliability of his model results.

Summaries of the actual plant nutrient parameter input files that Dr. Engel used for pasture, crop, forest and urban land uses in his GLEAMS model are contained in Appendix B of my expert report. Also included in Appendix B are tables containing line-by-line descriptions of each plant nutrient parameter input file for each of these land uses. Below are concise summaries of my key points for the nutrient parameter inputs used by Dr. Engel in his GLEAMS model.

Pasture is the most important land use category in Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model because he represents almost half of the 1,000,000 acres in the IRW as pasture land and he assumes that poultry litter is applied to every acre of this pasture land. His GLEAMS model inputs for pasture land are based directly on example Table A-19 from the GLEAMS Manual (Table 1). He used 10 default values from GLEAMS and 10 generic values taken directly from Table A-19. Note that blanks in GLEAMS model input files signify that the internal GLEAMS default value is used instead of a value externally specified by the user.

For pasture land, Dr. Engel provided his own values for only seven of the 27 required GLEAMS nutrient parameter inputs (Page D-41 of his expert report):

- AOM: organic matter content in animal waste
- APHOS: total phosphorus content in animal waste
- APORGP: organic phosphorus content in animal waste
- CLAB: labile phosphorus concentration in the soil horizon
- DF: date of fertilizer application
- RATE: application rate for animal waste
- RESDW: crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins

Apart from CLAB, as discussed above, four of these seven nutrient parameter inputs are described on Page D-18 of Dr. Engel's expert report. These include RATE for total applied litter (223,000 tons/year on a dry weight basis), APHOS (2.08%), APORGP (0.98 organic P/total P) and DF (April 1).

The most important of these GLEAMS nutrient inputs are RATE, APHOS and total applied litter phosphorus (4,642 P tons/year). As described on Pages 19 and 20 in Appendix B of Dr. Engel's expert report and summarized in two spreadsheets (Smith00003221_New_Calculations.xls and Engel00000186_Poultry_Comp_forBernie.xls) produced by the Plaintiffs, the only data from the IRW Dr. Engel used to develop the GLEAMS input values for these parameters were the numbers of birds in each IRW county. All of the other data required to develop input values for

these parameters (average manure generation rates in lb/finished bird, average moisture contents, average percent total phosphorus on a dry weight basis, and average bird weights at market) were taken from Nutrient Management Plans (NMPs) for a different watershed than the IRW. Ms. Megan Smith, who conducted the phosphorus mass balance study in Appendix B of Dr. Engel's expert report, under Dr. Engel's direction, admitted in her September 10, 2008, deposition that she does not know if the values reported in these NMPs are calculated numbers or production numbers based on actual data, and that she never investigated this.

Not only were most of the data used to develop these important parameters taken from a watershed other than the IRW, but Dr. Engel ignored phosphorus measurements for litter samples (APHOS) collected by the Plaintiffs from 20 poultry houses in the IRW, as well as samples collected from poultry litter fallen from trucks (Olsen Expert Report, Page 2-3). Dr. Engel derived his value for APHOS by simply dividing total applied litter phosphorus (4,642 P tons/year, Appendix B, Engel expert report) by his value for total applied litter (223,000 tons/year on a dry weight basis) for the IRW.

The rates of poultry litter application (RATE) assumed by Dr. Engel in his GLEAMS model do not reflect actual practices in the IRW. Dr. Engel divided all of the pasture land in the IRW into four zones and assumed that poultry litter in his GLEAMS model was applied uniformly to each acre within each of these four zones. In his deposition he stated that the rates of application he assumed in his model were not the rates per acre actually applied in the IRW. This is important because half of the 1,000,000 acres in the IRW in Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model is represented as pasture land and he applies poultry litter to all pasture land in his model.

Dr. Engel also assumed that all of the poultry litter in his GLEAMS model is applied on a single day each year (NF = 1) for all pasture land in the entire IRW and that this date is April 1 (DF = April 1). This does not reflect actual practices in the IRW, nor is it consistent with Dr. Engel's own expert report. As shown in Figure 4.1 of Dr. Engel's report, poultry litter is applied in the IRW during each month from January to December of each year.

This means that in Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model the total amount of poultry litter applied for the entire year is applied on a single day in a single "heap" regardless of whether it is raining or dry. This does not reflect actual practices in the IRW.

Dr. Engel determined APORGP by using APHOS and assuming that the ratio of organic and total phosphorus taken from the GLEAMS Manual (Knisel and Davis 2000) was appropriate for the IRW. He did not document how he determined AOM or RESDW in his GLEAMS model.

For crop and forest land use areas, again most of nutrient parameter inputs Dr. Engel used for his GLEAMS model are default or generic values, with the exception of CLAB as described above. His GLEAMS inputs for crop land are based on example Table A-20 from the GLEAMS Manual (Table 2). He used 28 default values and 37 generic values taken directly from Table A-20. His GLEAMS inputs for forest land are based on example Table A-21 from the GLEAMS Manual (Table 3). He used 20 default values and three generic values taken directly from Table A-21.

There are no examples for plant nutrient input files in the GLEAMS Manual for urban land because GLEAMS is an agricultural model. Dr. Engel set his GLEAMS inputs for urban land use with alfalfa-hay as the specified crop type. As described above, this is a misrepresentation because urban land is very different than agricultural land for growing hay. Dr. Engel used 18 default values and four generic values taken directly from Table A-21.

Overall, Dr. Engel used default or generic values for 130 of the 140 (93 percent) plant nutrient input parameters that he needed to run his GLEAMS model for the IRW. These default and generic values are not based on site-specific data for the IRW, nor is there any documentation in Dr. Engel's report of investigations he conducted to determine whether these values were appropriate for the IRW.

In summary, the phosphorus component of Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model is almost entirely a generalized application and is not specific to the IRW. Dr. Engel has not demonstrated that the nutrient inputs to his GLEAMS model represent real-world conditions in the IRW. If his model inputs do not represent real-world conditions, then neither can his model outputs. Consequently, Dr. Engel cannot claim that predictions from his model for phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW, or his predictions for which phosphorus sources come from which land uses, are accurate and reliable.

<u>Supporting Statement 2f:</u> In contravention to generally accepted practices in the scientific community, Dr. Engel did not compare the predictions for hydrology from his GLEAMS model to any observed data in the State of Arkansas or to most of the observed data in the State of Oklahoma.

To demonstrate that a model corresponds with reality it must be "confronted with data." A thorough model evaluation includes comparison of model predictions with the available site-specific data. If substantial portions of the available site-specific data are "left out" during the model evaluation process, a model cannot be considered accurate and reliable. While it would be appropriate to ignore observed data that fail to meet QA/QC criteria or that are not representative of the true system being modeled, Dr. Engel ignored the vast majority of the data available to him when he calibrated and purported to validate the hydrology component of his GLEAMS model.

This point is emphasized on Page 3 of SERA-17 (2005) where it is stated that, "In our opinion, watershed-scale predictions of loadings to lakes are not reliable unless extensive, site-specific calibration is used."

There are 15 USGS stations with measurements for daily average flow in the IRW (Figure 8). Dr. Engel compared the hydrology outputs from his GLEAMS model to observed data for monthly average flow at only three of these stations, Illinois River near Tahlequah, Baron Fork at Eldon, and Caney Creek near Barber. These are the last three stations before Lake Tenkiller and are the outlets for each of these three subwatersheds to the lake.

Dr. Engel ignored all of the observed data that were available at the seven USGS stations in Arkansas. These stations represent 22,273 measurements of daily average flow during 1997-2006. Dr. Engel also ignored observed data that were available at five additional USGS stations in Oklahoma besides the three outlet stations. These stations represent 17,074 measurements of daily average flow during 1997-2006.

Overall, there is a total of 50,030 measurements of daily average flow at the 15 USGS stations in the IRW during 1997-2006, including the three outlet stations on the Illinois River near Tahlequah, Baron Fork at Eldon and Caney Creek near Barber. Dr. Engel ignored 79 percent of

these measurements in his calibration and purported validation of the hydrology outputs from his GLEAMS model.

It is important to check a watershed model "along the way," not just at the downstream outlets. Failure to do so undermines the accuracy and reliability of the model for attributing the relative contributions of sources in the watershed. It is not just about how much water gets to the outlets, but also about where it came from and how it got there. If a model is to be used to make claims about phosphorus loads originating from local sources in the watershed, then it must be confronted with data that actually represent these local sources.

U.S. EPA (2008) recommends conducting sensitivity analyses to characterize the most and least important sources of uncertainty in environmental models. Sensitivity analysis investigates how model outputs are affected by changes in selected model inputs. On Page D-41 of his expert report Dr. Engel lists eight soil parameters that he calibrated and purported to validate for the hydrology component of his GLEAMS model. Dr. Engel stated in his deposition that he did not perform any sensitivity analyses with his models for the IRW. Consequently, the impacts of uncertainties in his GLEAMS hydrology parameters on the model results were not established and are unknown.

<u>Supporting Statement 2g:</u> In contravention to generally accepted practices in the scientific community, Dr. Engel did not compare the predictions for phosphorus loads to edge-of-field from his GLEAMS model to any observed data in the States of Arkansas or Oklahoma.

Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model predicts phosphorus loads at edges of streams and rivers in the IRW, and his routing model predicts phosphorus loads delivered to Lake Tenkiller at the last three USGS stations upstream of the lake. These two models are linked in series with the output of the GLEAMS model providing the input for the routing model. Dr. Engel uses these two linked models to predict not only the phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller, but the relative contributions of poultry litter to these phosphorus loads.

The U.S. EPA (2008) guidance on environmental models states on Page 12, that "When employing linked models, the project team should evaluate each component model as well as the full system of integrated models at each stage of the model development and evaluation process." Dr. Engel presented no results in his expert report for the evaluation of his GLEAMS model, but presented results only for his routing model by comparing it with observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller.

The phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller are a "soup" that represent the sum of all phosphorus sources in the entire IRW and contain no information on the relative contributions of any individual source. For Dr. Engel's models to support claims on the relative contributions of poultry litter, they must be "confronted with data" at the source of these poultry litter contributions, not at the last three stations before the lake where these contributions have become part of the "soup." This means that Dr. Engel's GLEAMS model must be compared with observed data at edge-of-field.

This point is emphasized on Page 3 of SERA-17 (2005) where it is stated that, "In our opinion, watershed-scale predictions of loadings to lakes are not reliable unless extensive, site-specific

Finally, the concept of model "validation" put forth by Dr. Engel is at odds with the position by Dr. Scott Wells, another expert for the Plaintiffs who used the results from Dr. Engel's models for his own model of Lake Tenkiller. Dr. Wells presented a paper entitled, "Surface Water Hydrodynamics and Water Quality Models: Use and Misuse" at the 23rd Annual Water Law Conference, San Diego, CA, February 24-25, 2005. On Page 9 of that paper Dr. Wells states, "If a model is applied to an independent data set and the model matches data well with the original parameter set, then one can say that the model was calibrated well to the 2 time periods under consideration. When the term validation is used, it makes others think that the model is "valid" and does not have serious weaknesses. This though can be an inappropriate label. Hence, discarding the term altogether would eliminate this misconception."

Again, consistent with U.S. EPA (2008) guidance, and with the position by Dr. Wells, Dr. Engel's purported "validation" is an inappropriate characterization and no claims of validity or lack of serious weaknesses can be implied.

Not only were the models in Dr. Engel's expert report not validated, but the calibration approach used by Dr. Engel was circular and fundamentally flawed. Consequently, the results from his models do not have scientific credibility nor are they useful for supporting environmental decisions.

<u>Supporting Statement 2j:</u> Dr. Engel did not follow his own published guidance on procedures for standard application of hydrologic/water quality models.

Dr. Engel was the senior author on a paper entitled, "A Hydrologic/Water Quality Model Application Protocol," that was published in the Journal of the American Water Resources Association, October 2007, Volume 43, No. 5, Pages 1223-1236. This paper was co-authored by Dan Storm, Mike White, Jeff Arnold and Mazdak Arabi.

On Page 1224 of his paper, Dr. Engel stated that, "By definition, the scientific method is impartial and the results from the application of the scientific method must be reproducible. Therefore, the modeling protocol and associated documentation must provide enough detail to allow the modeling project to be repeated."

On Page 1231 of his paper, Dr. Engel stated that, "For projects supporting regulatory decision-making, the USEPA (2002) suggests the level of detail on model calibration in the Quality Assurance Project Plan should be sufficient to allow another modeler to duplicate the calibration method, if the modeler is given access to the model and to the data being used in the calibration process."

In an E-mail on August 13, 2008, from David Page to Robert George, the following information was provided in response to a request by the Defendants for a step-by-step procedure for generating GLEAMS model outputs for daily phosphorus loads: "Calibrated yearly GLEAMS files were manually modified to better match P load timing by modifying labile phosphorus concentrations in the soil horizon."

A letter on December 8, 2008, from Ms. Claire Xidis to Mr. Robert George, stated that "... Dr. Engel has informed us that the parameters used for the routing equations are included in the errata. These were obtained by adjusting the parameters to match the observed data. The

3. The modeling results put forth by Dr. Engel in his expert report are not accurate or reliable to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty.

<u>Supporting Statement 3a:</u> The routing model developed by Dr. Engel can be calibrated using a wide range of different watershed loadings, including random values; consequently, his calibration does nothing to corroborate his GLEAMS model outputs or his WWTP loads.

The models developed by Dr. Engel are insensitive to changes in the timing of his phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW and to wide ranges in the magnitudes of his phosphorus loads from nonpoint source runoff and WWTPs. It can even be shown that predictions from Dr. Engel's phosphorus routing model can still be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller for random inputs. In practical terms, Dr. Engel's models cannot tell the difference between actual phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW and phosphorus loads that are simply made up.

I conducted a series of analyses with the phosphorus routing model described on Page D-21 of Dr. Engel's expert report. I conducted these analyses using Dr. Engel's routing model spreadsheet ("p_model_10_15.xls") and values from within his allowable ranges for each of the four coefficients (a, b, c and initial P accumulation) in this model, as described in his expert report and in his deposition.

Figure 19 shows that if the chronologies for Dr. Engel's predicted phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW for 1998-2006 are reversed, his phosphorus routing model can still be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller. Specifically, Dr. Engel's predicted daily nonpoint source loads from GLEAMS plus his WWTP loads were reversed from last day to first day for each of the three subwatersheds in the IRW. Upon comparison of results in Figure 19 with those in Dr. Engel's expert report (reproduced in the top panels of Figures 15-17) it can be seen that the results for the reversed chronologies are practically the same for the Illinois River near Tahlequah (R² decreases from 0.974 to 0.963) and are actually improved for both Baron Fork (R² increases from 0.781 to 0.914) and Caney Creek (R² increases from 0.625 to 0.7214).

This demonstrates that Dr. Engel's models are not sensitive to the timing of his predicted daily phosphorus loads over his 9-year calibration and purported validation period from 1998 to 2006. In fact, his models produce somewhat better results when his predicted daily phosphorus loads (plus WWTP loads) are run backwards in time. Because predicted daily phosphorus loads from his GLEAMS model are driven by rainfall events, and he treated WWTP loads as daily background loads, this means that Dr. Engel's linked GLEAMS and routing models cannot tell the difference between rainy days and dry days in the IRW.

It can also be shown that wide ranges in the magnitudes of Dr. Engel's WWTP loads, and his predicted phosphorus loads from GLEAMS, can still be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller by his phosphorus routing model. Figure 20 shows the ranges in each of these phosphorus load components to streams and rivers in the IRW that can still be calibrated to Dr. Engel's observed P loads to Lake Tenkiller each year from 1998 to 2006. The top panel

shows results for WWTP loads to streams and rivers, and the bottom panel shows results for predicted phosphorus loads from GLEAMS to streams and rivers. Note that the phosphorus loads in this figure are shown on logarithmic scales. The vertical scales in each panel are extremely large and range from 10,000 to 1,000,000,000 lbs P/year.

For each of the three subwatersheds (Illinois, Baron Fork and Caney Creek), Dr. Engel's routing model was re-calibrated to fit these increased WWTP and GLEAMS nonpoint source loads to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller with R² values equal to or greater than those in his expert report.

In practical terms, if there were an additional 96,727,276 people in the IRW, an almost 345-fold increase, then Dr. Engel's routing model can still be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller with the additional WWTP loads from this population (plus the nonpoint source phosphorus loads from GLEAMS). This WWTP load estimate is based on a human population of 280,383 in 2000 (Table 2 in Appendix B of Dr. Engel's expert report) and an annual per capita production rate of 1.298 lbs P/year which can be calculated from the information in Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix B. This example is conservative because it assumes that all of the waste generated from the additional population is untreated and that 100 percent of it is delivered directly to streams and rivers in the IRW.

Again in practical terms, if there were an additional 2,356,541,356 birds per year in the IRW, a greater than 15-fold increase, then Dr. Engel's routing model can still be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller with the additional nonpoint source phosphorus loads from GLEAMS (plus Dr. Engel's WWTP loads). This estimate of additional birds is based on materials produced by Dr. Engel ("Smith00003221_New_Calculations.xls") stating that there were 151,781,155 birds (broilers, layers, pullets, turkeys) in the IRW in 2002 and that each bird produces an average of 0.0612 lb P/year. Again, this example is conservative because it assumes that all litter from these additional birds is applied to pastures and that 100 percent of the phosphorus in this litter runs off to streams and rivers.

I make no claim that the annual per capita production rate of 1.298 lbs P/year or the average annual production rate per bird of 0.0612 lb P/year are accurate, but only that these are the values that can be derived from materials produced by Dr. Engel.

These results show that the phosphorus routing model developed by Dr. Engel, when presented with a wide universe of possibilities, cannot even come close to "pinning down" the real nonpoint source runoff loads to streams and rivers in the IRW, nor can it tell the difference between Dr. Engel's WWTP loads and WWTP loads that are many times higher.

Furthermore, if Dr. Engel's routing model cannot "pin down" either of these individual phosphorus sources, then neither can it "pin down" their relative contributions. Because his model cannot tell the difference between such a large increase in a particular source, then it cannot be accurate and reliable for allocating phosphorus loads back to individual sources in the IRW.

As a final demonstration that Dr. Engel's phosphorus routing model cannot "pin down" the real phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW, I determined that it can actually be calibrated to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller for random inputs. Figure 21 shows predicted versus observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller in the Illinois River near Tahlequah for the calibration and purported validation results in Dr. Engel's expert report (top

panel) and daily S&P 500 Stock Index values (bottom panel) for the same period (1998-2006). The R² values are 0.974 for both sets of results. In simple terms, Dr. Engel's routing model cannot tell the difference between phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW and stock index values.

In summary, the models developed by Dr. Engel are conceptually flawed, not scientifically credible and not reliable quantitative tools. His models can accept inputs that do not make any sense and calibrate these inputs to his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller. Therefore, the relationships between his model inputs, which are phosphorus loads from the watershed, and his observed phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller make no sense.

Dr. Engel's models cannot tell the difference between rainy days and dry days in the IRW, nor can they tell the difference between his own phosphorus loads to streams and rivers, and phosphorus loads that are simply made up. When presented with a wide universe of possibilities, Dr. Engel's routing model cannot even come close to "pinning down" the real phosphorus loads to streams and rivers in the IRW, nor can it "pin down" the relative contributions of individual sources. Dr. Engel's models are not reliable quantitative tools for predicting phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller or the relative contributions of any individual sources to these phosphorus loads.

<u>Supporting Statement 3b:</u> The opinion by Dr. Engel that poultry litter land application in the IRW is a substantial contributor to phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller is based on model results and methods that are conceptually flawed, incorrect and not reliable.

Opinion 8 on Page 2 of Dr. Engel's expert report states that, "Poultry waste land application in the IRW is a substantial contributor (45% between 1998 and 2006 and 59% between 2003 and 2006) to P loads to Lake Tenkiller, representing the largest P source." The phosphorus allocation to each source is shown in Tables 10.14 and 10.15 on Page 93 of Dr. Engel's expert report.

First, Opinion 8 is based on results from Dr. Engel's models that are not reliable to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. Second, even if Dr. Engel fixes all of the deficiencies in his models, as described above in my Opinion 2 and Supporting Statements 2a through 2m, and follows SERA-17 guidance, U.S. EPA recommendations on environmental models, and his own protocol for application of hydrologic/water quality models, his entire modeling framework remains conceptually flawed and inappropriate for the IRW. Third, as described below, the methods that Dr. Engel used to develop the phosphorus allocations to sources in his Opinion 8 are themselves conceptually flawed, undocumented, contain numerous errors and inconsistencies, and are not reliable to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty.

Dr. Engel's models predict only total phosphorus loads and contain no information on individual sources of phosphorus. He stated in his deposition that neither his GLEAMS nor his routing model identifies poultry litter as a phosphorus source and that this identification requires interpretation of outputs from these models after they are run. Dr. Engel uses a separate allocation method ("allocation_5_2.xls") to process and interpret the outputs from his GLEAMS and phosphorus routing models, and determine the relative contributions of individual sources to phosphorus loads to Lake Tenkiller. Despite the importance of these results in forming his Opinion 8, Dr. Engel did not include any documentation in his expert report of the methods he

January 23, 2009

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF GLEAMS MODEL INPUT FILES

Summaries of Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input Files for Pasture Land Use Table B-1.

Expert Report of Victor J. Bierman, Jr.

1) GLEANS original (mital) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files and 2NP. PAR files located in the following directories:

"NURHIAWIExpert_Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Ennal!!!. FUTURE_100YRULINOIS/ORGINPUT

"N'URWLAWI Expert_Reports|EngelMaterials|Gleams_Final1.1.FUTURE_100TRBARRONFORT\OriginInput

"N:URWLAWY Expert_Reports/Engel Materials/Gleams_Finals! 1.FUTURE_1007R/CANETCREEK/OriginInput

2) GLEAMS calibrated (final) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the ILLINOIS. BARRONFORT, and CANEYCREKS sub-folders:

3) Knisel, W.G. and Davis, F.M. 2000. GLEAMS (Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems), Version 3.0, User Manual. Pub. No. SEPRL-WGKFMD-030199. "N:URHILAWI Expert_Reports!EngelMaterials!Gleams_Final\1.1.FUTURE_100YR*"

6) Perameter input value ronges set for the automated calibration proceedure via the Shuffled Complex Evolution Algorithm (SCE-UA) were extracted from the "SCE-DAT" file in the ILLINOIS

BARRONFORT, and CANEYCREEK sub-folders in the following directory: "N:URWLAWI Expert Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Final 1.1 FUTURE_1007R*"

Lake Penkiler, Esperi Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma, In Case No. 05-CU-329-GKF-SAI, State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma), Dr. B. Engel, P.E. Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 22, 2008"

4) "Expart Report" refers to "Poultry Waste Generation and Land Application in the Illinois River Watershed and Phosphorus Loads to the Illinois River Watershed Streams and Rivers and

s) E-mail correspondence on Wednesday, August 13, 2008 8:27 AM; From David Page: To Robert George, Louis Builoock, David Riggs, Elisabeth Claire Xids:

Subject, RE: Follow Up Items from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Pasture Land Use (INP.PAR, 2NP.PAR)

Summary of Original (Initial) Parameter Input Values and Calibrated (Final) Parameter Input Values

	Jan	Š	Illino Rive (Zone	Hinois River (Zone 2) ^t	Illinois River (Zone 3) ¹	10is 197 1.3) t	.	Beron Fork	Caney	94	Constraint
Name	Description		Original Input Value	brated .	Original Input	Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Original Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	
O MOV	Organic matter content in animal waste.	%	5.69	\$'69	\$,69	69.5	21.0	21.0		21.0	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0.12 and 86.0 using an automated calibration.
APHOS	Total phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	2.35	2.35	2.35	2.35	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 1 664 and 2.496 using an automated calibration.
APORGP C	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	\$6'0	\$6'0	\$6'0	\$6.0	26'0	0.97	6.07	76.0	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0.95 and 0.99 using an automated calibration.
			71.9	61.7	133.2	114.2	138.6	61.9	52.8	40.0	Parameter inputs are listed one to five for each soil horizon Illinois River parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 100 and 7101 sites an automated calibration.
CLABO	soil borizon.	8/3m	68.2	45.5	126.3	84.3	130.2	45.7	49.7	29.5	Baron Fork and Caney Creek parameter input values calibrated and constrained
	(Number of soil horizons = 5)		47.5	40.7 37.5	0.88 0.08	75.4 69.4	126.4	40.9 37.6	48.3 45.5	26.4	between 80 and 150 using an automated cathoration. All sub-basin labile phosphous input values were manually modified after the arromanted cathoration.
DF D	Date of fettilizer application, year of the crop rotation and Julian day.	No Units	1077	1066	1077	1066	1099	1077	1037	1077	Illinois River parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 60.0 and 300 using an automated calibration. Baron Fork and Carcy Creek parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 100 and 120 using an automated calibration.
RATE	Application rate for animal waste.	tr/ha	69'0	0.50	1.29	0.93	1.04	6.59	01.0	0.10	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0.10 and 1.20 using an automated calibration.
RESDW Cr	Crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	3258.6	3258.6	3258.6	3258.6	4362.3	4362.3	62.3	62.3	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0 and 7,000 using an automated calibration.

GLEAMS default parameter value applied. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use.

Generic or example value from p.191 of the GLEAMS user manual applied unless noted otherwise. This parameter input walse was not calibrated for this particular land use. Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizar application.

would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized

The Illinois River sub-basin is comprised of nutrient loading Zone 2 and Zone 3 (see p. D-17 of Engel's Expert Report). There are separate pasture nutrient input files for Zone 2 and Zone 2 and the 2NP PAR file is specified for Zone 2 and the 2NP PAR file is specified for Zone 2.

Summary of Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Crop Land Use Table B-2.

Expert Report of Victor J. Bierman, Jr.

1) GLEAMS original (initial) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the following directories:

"N.URWLAWI'Exper_Reports\Engel\Materials\Gleams_Final\1.1.FUTURE_100YRVLLINOIS\ORGINPUT

"N: JRWLAWI) Expert_Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Final 1.1. FUTURE_100YR\BARRONFORT\OriginInput

"N:URWLAWIExpert_Reports/EngelMaterials/Gleams_Final/1.1.FUTURE_1007R/CANEYCREEK/OriginInput

2) GLEAMS calibrated (final) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the ILLINOIS, BARRONFORT, and CANEYCREEK sub-folders:

3) Knisel, W.G. and Davis, F.M. 2000. GLEAMS (Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems), Version 3.0, User Manual, Pub. No. SEWRL-WGK/FMD-050199, "N: URWIAW! Exper_Reports\Engel\Materials\Gleams_Final\1.1.FUTURE_100YR*"

Lake Tenkiller, Expert Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma, In Case No. 05-CU-329-GKF-SAJ, State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the 4) "Expert Report" refers to "Poultry Waste Generation and Land Application in the Illinois River Watershed and Phosphorus Loads to the Illinois River Watershed Streams and Rivers and Northern District of Oklahoma), Dr. B. Engel, P.E. Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 22,2008"

5) E-mail correspondence on Wednesday, August 13, 2008 8:27 AM: From David Page; To Robert George, Louis Bullock, David Riggs, Elizabeth Claire Xidis;

Subject, RE: Follow Up Items from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Crop Land Use (INC.PAR)

Summar	Summary of Original (Initial) Parameter Input Values and Calibratea (Final) Farameter Input Values	er Inpu	t Values an	id Calibrate	d (Final) F	arameter 1	nput ratue		
Panameter	Parameter	;	IIIE	Mibooks River	Ba	Baron Fork	Caney Creek	ney ek	Comment
Name	Description	III.	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	
AOM	Organic matter content in animal waste.	%	86.0 86.0	86.0 86.0	86.0 86.0	86.0 86.0	0.98 86.0	86.0 86.0	There are two fertilizer applications of animal waste, which requires two separate parameter input values.
APHOS	Total phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	0.82	0.82 0.82	0.82 0.82	0.82 0.82	0.82 0.82	0.82 0.82	There are two fertilizer applications of animal waste, which requires two separate parameter input values.
APORGP	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	0.79 0.79	0.79 0.79	0.79 0.79	0.79 0.79	0.79 0.79	0.79 0.79	There are two fertilizer applications of animal waste, which requires two separate parameter input values.
CLAB()	Labile phosphorus concentration in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons = 5)	8/8n	09	09	80	80	09	09	CLAB input values are the same for all soil horizons.
DF	fthe	No Units	1091 1140 2100	1091 1140 2100	1091 1140 2100	1091 1140 2100	1091 1140 2100	1091 1140 2100	There are three fertilizer applications, which requires three separate parameter input values. Two fertilizer applications consist of animal waste and one fertilizer application consists of inorganic commercial fertilizer.
RATE	Application rate for animal waste.	tn/ha	5.00 3.00	5.00 3.00	5,00 3,00	5.00 3.00	5.00 3.00	5.00 3.00	There are two fertilizer applications of animal waste, which requires two separate parameter input values.
RESDW	Crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	

Abbreviations:

Z Z DΕ

GLEAMS default parameter value applied. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use.

Generic or example value from p 191 of the GLEAMS user manual applied unless noted otherwise. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use. Not applicable. Parameter inputs required for fertilizer application would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized.

Summary of Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Forest Land Use Table B-3.

Expert Report of Victor J. Bierman, Jr.

]) GLEAMS original (mitial) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the following directories:

"N: JRWLAWI Expert_Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Final J. FUTURE_100YRULLINOIS ORGINPUT

"N: URWLAWI Expert_Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Finals I.FUTURE_100YR\BARRONFORT OriginInput "N:URWLAWI)Expert_Reports/Engel'Materials/Gleams_Final1.1.FUTURE_100YR(CANEYCREEK/OriginInput

2) GLEAMS calibrated (final) parameter input values were extracted from the IN*. PAR files located in the ILLINOIS, BARRONFORT, and CANEYCREEK sub-folders:

3) Knisel, W.G. and Davis, F.M. 2000, GLEAMS (Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems), Verston 3.0, User Manual. Pub. No. SEWRL-WGK FMD-050199. "N. URWLAWIExper_Reports Engel Materials Gleams_Final 1.1. FUTURE_100 YR (*"

4) "Expert Report" refers to "Poultry Waste Generation and Land Application in the Illinois River Watershed and Phosphorus Loads to the Illinois River Watershed Streams and Rivers and Lake Tenkiller, Expert Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma, In Case No. 05-CU-329-GKF-SAJ, State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the

5) E-mail correspondence on Wednesday, August 13, 2008 8:27 AM; From David Page: To Robert George, Louis Bullock, David Riggs, Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Northern District of Oklahoma), Dr. B. Engel, P.E. Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 22,2008"

Subject, RE: Follow Up Items from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Forest Land Use (INF.PAR)

Summar	Summary of Original (Initial) Parameter Input Values and Calibrated (Final) Farameter Input Values	er Inpui	t Values an	d Calibrate	d (Final) t	arameter 1	nput vatue	3	
Parameter	Parameter	;	Illinoù River	Illinois River	Pa To	Baron Fork	Caney Creek	iey ek	Comment
Name	Description	Caul	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	Original Calibrated Original Calibrated Input Value Input Value Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	
МОК	Organic matter content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
APHOS	Total phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
APORGP	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
CLAB0	Labile phosphorus concentration in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons = 5)	8/8n	10	20	30	20	01	25	CLAB input values are the same for all soil horizons. Labile phosphorus input values were manually modified during the calibration process.
DF	Date of fertilizer application, year of the crop rotation and Julian day.	No Units	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
RATE	Application rate for animal waste.	tn/ha	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
RESDW	Crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	

Abbreviations:

NA GN

GLEAMS default parameter value applied. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use. Generic or example value from p.191 of the GLEAMS user manual applied unless noted otherwise. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use.

Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizer application

would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized.

Summary of Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Urban Land Use Table B-4.

Sources of information:

Expert Report of Victor J. Bierman, Jr.

I) GLEAMS original (initial) parameter input values were extracted from the 1N° PAR files located in the following directories:

"N.URWLAWI Expert_Reports|Engel Materials|Gleams_Final\1.1.FUTURE_100YRULLINOIS\ORGINPUT

"N:URWIAWI\Expert_Reports\Engel\Materials\Gleams_Final\!\!.FUTURE_100YR\BARRONFORT\OriginInput

"N-JRWLAW1Expert_Reports|EngelMaterials|Gleams_Final\J.I.FUTURE_100YR|CANEYCREEK\OriginInput

2) GLEAMS calibrated (final) parameter input values were extracted from the IN*. PAR files located in the ILLINOIS, BARRONFORT, and CANEYCREEK sub-folders:

3) Knisel, W.G. and Davis, F.M. 2000. GLEAMS (Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems), Version 3.0, User Manual. Pub. No. SEWRL-WGK/FMD-050199. "N: URWLAWI Expert Reports Engel Materials (Gleams Final 11.1. FUTURE_100 YR.*"

4) "Expert Report" refers to "Poultry Waste Generation and Land Application in the Illinois River Watershed and Phosphorus Loads to the Illinois River Watershed Streams and Rivers and Lake Tenkiller, Expert Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma, In Case No. 05-CU-329-GKF-SAJ, State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the

5] E-mail correspondence on Wednesday, August 13, 2008 8:27 AM; From David Page; To Robert George, Louis Bullock, David Riggs, Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Northern District of Oklahoma), Dr. B. Engel, P.E. Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 22,2008"

Subject, RE: Follow Up Items from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Urban Land Use (INU.PAR)

Summar	Summary of Original (Initial) Parameter Inpu	ter Inpu	t Values an	ut Values and Calibrated (Final) Parameter Input Values	d (Final) P	arameter I	nput Value.	s	
Parameter	Parameter	ì	TIII.	Illinois River	Ba Fo	Baron Fork	Caney Creek	ey ek	Comment
Name	Description	CMI	Original Input Value	Calibrated Original Calibrated Input Value Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	Original Input Value	Calibrated Input Value	
AOM	Organic matter content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
APHOS	Total phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA A	NA	
APORGP	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste.	%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
CLAB0	Labile phosphorus concentration in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons = 5)	8/8n	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	
DF	Date of fertilizer application, year of the crop rotation and Julian day.	No Units	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
RATE	Application rate for animal waste.	trv/ha	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
RESDW	Crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	DF	

N A P.

GLEAMS default parameter value applied. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use.
Generic or example value from p.191 of the GLEAMS user manual applied unless noted otherwise. This parameter input value was not calibrated for this particular land use.
Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizer application

would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized.

Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input Files for Pasture Land Use Table B-5.

- Sources of information:

 1) CLEAMS permuster opin volum were natracted Free the 11th FAB flat and 220° FAS flat booted in the ILLINIUS, BARKONFORT, and CANEYCREEK sub-folders in the following threetory: "N: TREAL WI Expert Jospan's Bogart Materials Cleans, Proof. 1, 19/TTRE, 1909R**

) Theody W.G. and Deen, P.M. 2000 CLEAMS (Formathine and Cleans, Proof. 1, 19/TTRE, 1909R**

 3) Expert Report ** refer in ** Poultry Watte Convention and Land Application in the Illinois River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation and Land Application in the Illinois River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Formation River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads (Pale Wateriald River Wateriald Andrew Wateriald River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads to the Blacon River Wateriald and Phosphorus Loads (Phosphorus Wateriald River River Wateriald River Ri

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Pasture Land Use (1NP.PAR, 2NP.PAR)

		Parameter			Parum Valu			Source of	
Cord #	Parameter Name	Parameter Description	Unit	Illinois River (Zone 2)	Hinais River (Zone 5) 1	Baron Fork	Caney Creek	Parameter Value	Chaminet
ы	TM E	Three 80-character lines of alphanomeric information that identifies the particular computer ran. For example, the soil type, the crop rotation, the tillage practices, may be useful in identifying the file and specific GLEAMS application.	No Units	(Coke 2)	12000 3			GN	The run description does not provide any information regarding the eite-specific application to the IRW. The run description is a generic description that was taken from example imput file on p. 189 of the GLE-AMS user manual.
1	NBYR	Beginning year of plant nutrient simulation.	Year	1903	1901	1901	1901	AS	
	NEYR NUTOUT	Ending year of plant nutrient simulation. Code to designate level of printed nutrient output.	Year No Units	2000	2000	2000	2000	AS AS	
-;- -	FLGROT	Number of years in a crop rotation cycle.	No Units			1	1	A8	
4	FLGB4L	Code for output of N and P balance at the end each year of simulation.	No Units	. 0	0	0	0	AS	
5	RESDW	Crop residue on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	3258.6	3258.6	4962.3	62.3	CAL.	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0 as 7,900 using an automated calibration.
5	RCN	Nitrogen concentration in rainfull.	ррен	8.0	9.8	0.8	0.8	GN DF	
5	CNI	Concentration of nitrate-mitrages m strigation. Concentration of labile-phosphorus in irrigation.	ppm		 	 		DF	
6	TNO	Total nitrogen in each soil horizon (Number of soil horizons = 5).	76	0.055 0.055 0.643 0.643 0.021	0.055 0.055 0.043 0.043 9.021	9.053 9.055 9.043 9.043 9.043	0.055 0.055 0.043 0.043 0.043	GN	Parameter inputs are listed one to five for each soil horizon.
3	CNITO	Nitrate-nitrugen concentration in each soil-harizon. (Number of soil horizons = 5)	ng/g	10 16 7.0 7.0 3.0	10 10 7.6 7.0 3.0	10 10 7.0 7.0 3.0	10 18 7.0 7.0 3.0	GN	Parameter inputs are listed one to five for each soil horizon.
5	РОТМНО	Potestially mineralizable nitrogen in each soil horizon. (Number of seil horizons * 5)	kg/ha	150.0 150.0 230.0 230.0 115.0	150.0 150.0 230.0 230.0 115.0	150.0 150.0 230.0 230.0 115.0	150.0 150.0 230.0 330.0 115.0	GN	Parameter inputs are listed one to five for each soil horizon.
9	OHGNW	(Figure: nitrogen content from annual weste in the plow horizon.	%	0	6	0	8	GN	
10	TPO	Total phosphorus in each soil histizon.	*	T	T	I		DF	
"	CZABO	(Number of soil betterner. 5) Labile phosphorus concentration in each soil horizon. (Number of soil bestzens > 5)	48/E	61.7 52.1 45.5 40.7 37.5	114.2 96.5 84.3 75.4 69.4	51.9 52.3 45.7 40.9 37.6	46.0 33.8 29.5 26.4 24.3	CAL	Parameter inputs are listed one to five for each soil horizon. Illinois River parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 100 is 300 using an automated calibration. Parton Fork and Carely Creek parameter input values collibrated and combained between 80 and 150 using an automated calibration. All sub-basis labric phrosphorus input values were manually modified after the automated calibration.
12	ORGPW	Organic P content from animal waste in plow horizon.	%	0	8	0	8	GN	
13	PDATE	Date that the following parameters are valid, year of the crop rotation cycle and Julian day.	No Units	1991	1003	1001	1901	AS	
14	NF	Number of fertilizer and animal waste applications during the update period.	No Units	1	1	ı	1	AS	
1-1	NTIL	Number of tillage operations during the update period.	No Units	0	0	8	0	AS	
14	DHRIST	Date of crop harvest, year of the crop rotation cycle and Julian day.	No Units	1310	1316	1310	1310	ss	
15	ICROP	Identification number of the crop grown during this	No Units	2	2	3	2	ss	Alfalfa-hay is the crop type specified.
15	LEG	cropping period. Code for legume crop	No Units	0	B	0	0	DF	
15	PY	Potential yield for the harvestable portion of the crop.	kg/ba	4500	4500	4500	4500	DF	
	 	Dry matter ratio, the ratio of total dry matter production to	No Units	+	+	+	 	DF	
13	DMY	harvestable portion of the crop.	No Units	 		+	 	DF	
15 15	CNR RNP	Carbon mirogen ratio for the crop. Ratio of crop mirogen to phosphorus.	No Units	 		1		DF	
15	cı	Coefficient in the exponential relation to estimate nitrogen content of the eron.	No timits					DF	
15	C2	Exponent in the exponential relation to estimate netrogen content of the crop.	No Units					DF	
16	DF	Date of fertilizer application, year of the crop rotation and Julian day.	No Units	1066	1066	1077	1077	CAL	Illinois River parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 60: 300 using as automated calibration. Baron Fork and Canney Crock parameter input values were calibrated and constra between 100 and 120 using an automated calibration.
16	MFERT	Code for method of fertilization	No Units	1	1	1	1	AS	Code > I indicates that an organic (animal waste or sewage shidge) is applied
16	METHAP	Code for method of application.	No Units	G	0	9	0	AS	Code = 0 denotes surface application of featilizer or animal waste.
16	MTYPE	Code for assistal waste type.	No Units	15	15	15	15	AS	Code = 15 indicates that the user specifies total N and P, organic N and P, ammon soluble phosphorus in animal waste.
17	FN	Festilizer nitrate	kg/ha	1				NA NA	Card 17 is skipped if animal waste is applied.
17	FNH	Fortsliner ammenta	kg/ba	-		+	+	NA NA	Card. 17 is skipped if animal waste is applied. Card. 17 is skipped if animal waste is applied.
17	DEPIN	Fertilizer phosphorus. Depth of incorporation.	kg/ha cm	+	+	\pm	\pm	NA.	Card 17 is skipped if annual waste is applied.
17	FRTWAT	Depth of water applied for fertigation.	Care	T		_	\leftarrow	NA	Card 17 is skipped if animal waste is applied. All sub-basis parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0.
18	RATE	Application rate for animal waste.	tm/lsm	0.50	0.93	9.59	9.1	CAL	1.20 using an automated calibration
18	DEPIN	Depth of incorporation	56	2.81	2.81	2.83	2.81	GN	
18 18	APORGN	Total nitrogen in animal waste. Organic introgen content in animal waste.	%	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.00	GN	
18	ANH	Animonia content in animal waste. Total physihorus content in mimal waste.	%	6.72 1.70	0.72 1.70	9.72 2.35	9.72 2.35	GN CAL	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 1 and 2.496 using an automated calibration.
18	APORGE	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste:	96	0.95	0.95	0.97	8.97	CAL	All sub-basin parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0.9 10.99 using an automated calibration
18	AOM	Organic matter content in animal waste.	%	69.5	69.5	21.0	21.0	CAL	All sub-basis parameter input values were calibrated and constrained between 0 86.6 using an automated calibration.
18	WASTYT		No Units	. 1	1	1	+	A8	Code = 1 denotes that waste is in solid form.
19	NTDAY	Date of tillage, year of crop rotation cycle and Julian day.	No Units					N.A.	
19	LTII.	Code to designate the tillage implement or equipment uses	No Unite	4			 	NA NA	
19	EFFINO	Depth of tillage Efficiency of incorporation of surface residue.	No Unst	;	+	+	1	NA	
19	FMIX	Tellage mixing efficiency.	No Unit		I	1		NA NA	

- ORE:

 Application specific parameter value applied to set simulation time periods, output preferences, and parameter codes for particular method applications (e.g., method of fertilizations).

 GLEAMS default parameter value applied.

 Calderated parameter value applied.

 Generic se example value from p. 180 of the GLEAMS time manual applied unless noted otherwise.

 Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizar application would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized.

 Site-opecific parameter value applied.

'The Ultimote River sub-basis is comprised of outsignt loading Zone 2 and Zone 3 Leve p D-17 of Engels Expert Report). There are separate passure nuivent imput files for Zone 2 and Zone 3. The 1NP PAR nutrient imput file is specified for Zone 2 and the 2NP PAR file is operated by Zone 3.

Table B-6. Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Crop Land Use

Mercinal of Information.

10 (2018) primarily reductive an amount from the 10° 193 Min Install in the 11 (10 (2018) 2018 100 MIN reductive desired as earn amount from the 10° 193 Min Install in the 11 (10 (2018) 2018) 2018 100 MIN (2018) 2018 100

Column	Plant Nat	rient Pari	unseter Input Plu for Crop L and Use (IM	CPAR)			-		
		Parameter	Parameter			Value Value		Secret of	
		e American de la composition della composition d				Herea Port	Creek	Valer	
									The year description does not provide any independent arguiding the intersection
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	FA .	MUNE .	type. Sa ero relation. Do billings proclame, may be useful	No Orien	1	- 1	- 1	o n	application in the DEW. The rise description at a periodic description for two taken from
1			to the set marks G. S. A. M. make the						
1		AND	Projection from all dates and constitution of	Year	1060		1891	- (4	
1	7.1	AF7947.1	Carlo in Company In the All Company William Company	Mary	- 3			- 1	
1			Can be also as a Planta of the and was you of						
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.								ne .	
Page	h			_					
1		CW	Description of other property is transfer.						
1			Total stream in each and funtion.						
Page			Objects of and hyperson - 51						
1		(34E78)	200 (March 1997)						
1		NOTHING !	Proportially representative settingue, in each and testime. (Hearther of will bestime: 5)					190	
Fig. Compared to the compared of the compa		22.22	(many virginia contact from second warts in the plant					D#	
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.			Total phosphoras or under said bearing					- Febr	
Company Comp			Strates of our femiliary S						
Company Comp	"	CS.ABB	Latella pit tegènom concentration in secti sell'incorse. Offentes of sell basicion = 5)		40	-		CAL	Takin phasphane sayer return were namedly madelled during the collection process.
		OBSPT		~				D#	
## APAC And the first before generation of the first 100		100000			-	-			
1.5 1.5			Date that the following paymentax are valid, year of the					æ	
1		ļ	case solution cycle and Arlien day						
1		NOT .		No Com	,				
The content of the	"	нти.	Huaring of Miles symptoms during the system posted.	His Chains	,		,	CDK	
Part	7,	BARNET	Date, of complainment, your of the compressions systematic	No Uses	1264	1344	1244	one.	
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.			الله يعمل محمور ويت مثال معمور ويت المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة المعارفة الم					Om	Corporate in the creat three specialises.
## 27 Annual part of the harmonite speaks of the Corp. ## 27 Annual part of the harmonite speaks of the Corp. ## 27 Annual part of the Corp. ## 27 Annual part of the Corp. ## 27 Annual part of the Corp. ## 28 Annual part of the Corp. ## 28 Annual part of the Corp. ## 28 Annual part of the Corp. ## 29 Annual part of the Corp. ## 20 Annual p			Code Se Igranos como			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
Description			Principal ginta for the law restricts province of the coop.			Γ	Γ		
1.			Dry namer rate. Do rate of total dry poster production to		$\overline{}$				
23 1.5				10s Clarks		<u> </u>		DY.	
23 7	15		Bath of one allows to riembore				-	07	
1.									
Married Color Co	n	a l		No the		L		DF	
## APPEAR Cale In maked of applications Machine 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1				1	Ides	100°1	1001		There so two the thirse applications of missed white. The first DF (2017) is for the first application and the accord DF (1 + 07) in the the occured application. Here that such
	"		Addison Many	No Create	1140	1140	11-4) ***	advergend upon parameter value will have two inputs, nor for each fielderer
## 2017/19 Cube for small or origination. ## 2017/19 Cube for small			list be until a latinate	Math			1	(36)	
## 1977 Col. Ser main stand type ## 1978 Col. Ser main stand type ## 1979 Col. Ser main stand type ## 1970 Col. Ser main stand ## 1970 Col. Ser main stan						++			Code ~) despise incomparated Briffican or mintal warts.
Fig.						-	1 :		
A					<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1		
For Company	- 17 E	79	Forther manual					NA.	
## PATENT Depth of month patient Experts Depth of month patient Experts Depth of month patient Depth of months in mind of month Depth of months in mind of months Depth of months Depth of months in mind of months Depth of mon				-	 		├	<u> </u>	Card 17 to skipped t/ micros/ waste at applied. Card 17 is skipped if energy waste is applied.
## AJPS	12	PRIVAT	Dough of water parties for farmation					- M	Card 17 to skipped if animal waste is applied.
## 179 Total minings in insend value ## 179		RAPE	Application rate for mixed World.	**	3.00				
A Annaham canada in a small atoms N 231 132 133 135	P	MPEN	trepts of incorporation.	-	10	1 "		ow	[
APPAINS Cogne integration counted to most forms N 170 175 17	-	2599	Total miragen so beised whete:		1,40	1.40	1.40	ON.	
APRIL The planeture counter to consider them. 1, 14 1, 15 10		100000	Course when your to mind with	-	177			d#	
APRICE Total plumphone content or someth reads					123	122	106	700	<u> </u>
27					1.85	1.55	1.195		
12		APROT	Treat phosphorus concluse in second wants		0.00	e az			
18	2.0	wasar	Organic phosphorus cratical in asimal blocks.	-	9.79	6.79	9.77	ом	
## ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ###	n	409/	Organic smiles analysis in around works	*	P	94.0		GP	
	-	FATTE	The of mind may (a.e. mild sheet, or food).	No 12mm	4 '	, ,	1 '	OH.	Cody = 1 denotes that wants is in satisf from
APSI	-		h	 	1	I	1	†	These cutties are specified for these superate allege operations. The first MTDAY
APSI	-	VMAY	Case of Albama, your of case waters credy and Piller Ser	N= 0	1091	1001	7051	an a	(1991) is for the first talkage equivalent, the second FFTDA F (1997) at the few densities of the first talkage equivalent. Here there is not the first talkage equivalent. Here the first talkage equivalent is talkage equivalent.
1.75	1 "			ľ	1 355	1255	+259]	that and adversarie input preparate with will have five inpute, we like each allege
## 177 Comment of the Comment of t		†		1	16	10			
Proceedings	"	T.PAT	Code to designific the Militage implement or equipment their	No Outs	10	19	12	1	
## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ##	-		Daniel of Silvers	-	TO I	1 :	1 3	oper .	
Fig. Fig. Stage (1986) Stage	L	L		10.000	15		12		
24 PALL		Louis.	The rive of the party	No Units	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
24 PALL			Fac following topal resilies	instades par	7				
1	1 20	P0.428	these that the Callering parameters are white, year of the copy remains cycle and John day.	No Viedle	1001	2001	3007	GP4	
17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18	34	100	Humber of Sections and second wome applications during	No Units	1	1	T	GP4	
March Marc		-	Name of Class and the County of Coun			·	T ,		
March Marc		+		+	 	+	+	 	
1	14	283437	to the same above.	ļ					
15			I destification product of the every groves during the		99	1 54	, se		Septements cap in the trap (yet specified
17 Mart Style			Code by human (Fig.		+	+-	+		
17			Potential pieté de les hartuntales portion of the crop			+			
A			harvestable posters of the step.		1	1	-		
	11	+ 25		No Uses	1_	<u> </u>			
25 C Property in configuration for the composition of the compo			Conflicted in the emponential relation to naturals are not			Γ			
March Section Sectio			Depression in the expressional relations to contamin subreques		1	T	1	DF	
B. Marrier Charle for method of the infection St. Charle St. Charle		†	Comment of the comment	+	†	†	1	+	There we two factions applications of accord waste, The flast DF (109) is for the fir.
## METERS** Sight for method of millioning and paints from the liber 1	-	1		J	_i	1	1	1	application and the second DF (1+46) in the the recent application.
March Comparison Comparis		MPERT						(SEE	"Juda = 0 melapana dan sa mengamia (compani pal) destituar sa septimi Cada = 1 dagam igeorges and farbituar sa serio di weste.
Frag. Frag. Francisco consenses March 7 33 33 35 37 37 37 37	M.	AGE THE AP	Code for empty when the	No Diese	!			1 1	
Comparison Com	17	F/V	Faritificas nitrotis Faritificas nitrotis	1000	1 3,	1 22			
C PREFECT Depth of event organization for influences and an expension of the control of the cont	77		Fertilites phosphorus	Links.	45	15	. 35	CBH .	
9 A.77 Application nor the consult works. 1978 A. Consult is a signed a community matter a consult work. 1978 A. Consult is a signed a community matter a consult work. 1978 A. Consult is a signed a community matter a gold of the consult of the	17	ZETTAT	Donath oil wrister applical for destination	1 -	1		T	D.F	A. F. G. T. W
## APC Test and designed in comment and million in agricult. ## APC September Septem		2477	Application sate for assured treatm. Depth of incorporation.		<u> </u>			MA.	Card 18 to stripped if commercial fertilizer is appared. Card 18 to stripped if commercial fertilizer is applied.
## ACTOR Control of the Control of t	- 4		Yorlal mitrogen in animal waite	13	-	\vdash	F	- M	Card 18 is shipped if commercial farithrer is applied. Card 18 is skupped if commercial fertilizer is anched.
## APON Complete and the appeal of the appea	- A		3446	1 :	_	!	1	MA	
## APPA Comparison of the comp	H	APPROPRIE	And the contract in contract in the contract i	- 1	+-	+	1	WA.	Card 18 is skipped if communical flethings is applied. Card 18 to skipped if communical fletifizer is applied.
27 272.47 Date of Shippe, your of oncy continue cycle and Males Age No. Union 1,000	# # #	APPROPRIES			+		-	364	
F	# # # # #	APONEDI APROS APONEDI APONEDI		*				7.7	These unities are specified the three separate follows operations. The first KTDAY
F	# # # # #	APONEDI APROS APONEDI APONEDI		*	+	-	1		
F	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	APDROPH APPENS APPENS APORTE APORTE VALUE	Copied afterstance created in member 2004. Copied afterstance copied in member with Copyring copied and design in member graph. Type of graned worth (e.g., mind, phany, or Resting.	H ₂ Code	2186	/109 1109	73 to	OM.	(ITOS) on the the first allings appearation, the second MYEAY (HOS) in the the second allings operation, and the third MYDAY (2005) in the the first dillags operation. Not
	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	APONEN APRO APROS APONEN VALITY	Copied afterstance created in member 2004. Copied afterstance copied in member with Copyring copied and design in member graph. Type of graned worth (e.g., mind, phany, or Resting.	H ₂ Code	1186 7180 1385	7100 1100 1305	73 60 15 65 15 65	OS4	(2700) on the the first tillings operation, the special PTEAV (1905) is the the second stillings operation, and the third PTEAV (2005) is the the fined tillings operation. Not thing expension, and the third sects of the second tillings operation. Not thing the second tillings are the second ti
	# # # # # # #	APONEN APRIL APONEN A APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN A	Level aftergrings review in a more in mer. Cognets benefits to configure in attends with Cognets cannot make in mile a greek of greek. Dogs of configure works for a miles, aftergring in particular Dogs of configure, your of coop continue cycle and foliam day Dogs of configure, your of coop continue cycle and foliam day.	No Unite			+-,-	ļ	(2100) on the first hings appeared to the record NYZAV (1909) in the terroral diffrage operation, and the hird HYDAY (2005) is the tim belof diffrage appearance. Not things capacities, but the hird HYDAY (2005) is the tim belof diffrage appearance. Not things of the control of the second of the control of
	# # # # # # #	APONEN APRIL APONEN A APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN APONEN A	Level aftergrings review in a more in mer. Cognets benefits to configure in attends with Cognets cannot make in mile a greek of greek. Dogs of configure works for a miles, aftergring in particular Dogs of configure, your of coop continue cycle and foliam day Dogs of configure, your of coop continue cycle and foliam day.	No Unite	1 1	, i	, 23	ļ	(210) in the fact that of the control of the contro
P 177PH Offices of investment of the control of the	# # # # # # # #	APONERIA APO	Long Specimen a credit in street, steel. Course of principal country is a control to the country of the countr	No Unite He Unite	1 1	, i	, 23	aw.	(2000) in the first thing agents, the second YELAY (1979) in the second Higgs contains, and the first Higgs (professor, and the first HICAY (2009) in the first Higgs contains, but the second Higgs contains, but the second subsequent topic processor when will keep these layers, use the tech tilling seconds.
19 PACY Things regard efficients No Contr. 12	月 月 月 月 月 月 月 月 月	APOSET APOSES APOS APOSES APOS	Code of Managaman a Street Code. Copper and an asset of managaman and proper Code of the	My Code No Unite L He Unite	12 12 10 15	23 19	1, 1,	ar ar	(2000) as for first tables specified, the reconstricting (1905) as for security (1905) as for first reconstricting (1905) as for security (1905) as for first reconstricting (1905) as for first reconstructing (1905) as for first reconstruction (1905) as for firs

Addressional Application specific processes rather applied to set absolution from prevels, company professionar, and parameter codes for particular method applications (e.g., method of fertilization or a NAME is delice a construction of the Const

CAL Collected parameter value application.

OF County in cranique value fixing p. 190 of the CE.RAMS man assessed implicit radius near of otherwise.

NA Management Parameter layers value energy not be required if counting recolar attributes are not selected. For recomple, parameter imprise required the fertilized applications.

wented next be required if a particular least new or finds the Situmporatio permeasure within applical.

Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Forest Land Use Table B-7.

Sources of information: 1) GLEAMS parameter input

Sources of information:

1) GLEMS parameter input values were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the ILLINOIS, BARRONFORT, and CANETCREEK nil-folders in the following directory: "N-IRRITANTES,port RepursiFingelMaterials/Gleams, Final) 1. LFUTURE, 100TR**

2) Kintel, WG and Davis, Fish. 2000. GLEMS (Troumbette Loading Effects of Agricultura Management Systems), Version 3.0. User Manual, Pub. No. SEBRU-WGK/FMD-050199.

3) "Expert Report" refers to "Poulory Wasse Generation and Land Application in the Illinois from Watershed and Phaspherus Loads to the Illinois Rhow Watershed Sweams and Rivers and Lake Tentiller, Expert Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma, in Case No. 0.5-CU-329-GKF-SAJ, State of Oklahoma v. Tyxon Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma). Dr. B. Engel, Per Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 72,2008.

4) E-mail correspondence on Wedwedoy, August 13, 2008 & 77 AM; From David Page; To Robert George, Louis Bullock, David Riggs, Eleabeth Cleire Xidis; Subject, RE: Follow Up Hense from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Forest Land Use (INF.PAR)

	Parameter	Parameter			Parameter Value		Source of Parameter	Comment
Card #	Name	Description	Unit	Hlinois	Baron Fork	Caney Creek	Parameter Value	Comment
J-3	тте	Three 80-character lines of alphanumenic information flast identifies the particular computer run. For example, the soil type, the crop rotation, the tilinge practices, stay be asserted in identifying the file and specific GLEAMS application.	No Units	River			GN	The run description does not provide any information regarding the site-specific application to the IRW. The run description is a generic description that was taken from an example input file on p. 189 of the GLEAMS user manual.
4	NBYR	Beginning your of plant nutriest simulation.	Year	1901	1901	1901	AS	
4	NEYR	Ending your of plant nutrient armelation.	Your	2000	2000	2000	AS	
4	NUTOUT	Code to designate level of printed natrices output.	No Units No Units	1	2	2	AS AS	
- 1	FLGROT	Number of years in a crop rotation cycle. Code for output of N and P balance at the end each year of						
4	FI,GBAL	signistion.	No Units	0	0	0	AS DE	
5	RESDW	Crop resides on the ground surface when simulation begins.	kg/ha	<u> </u>				
5	RCN	Nitroges concentration in rainfall.	ppm		ļ	<u> </u>	DF	<u> </u>
5	CNI	Concentration of nitrate-nitrogen in strigation.	ppen			├	DF	
5	CPI	Concentration of labile-phosphorus in irrigation. Total pitrogen in each soil horizon.	bbsa	 	 	 	1	
6	TNO	(Number of soil horizons = 5)	*		<u> </u>	ļ	DF	
7	CNTT0	Nitrate-nitrogen concentration in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons ≈ 5)	uap/g		ļ		DF	
8	POTMING	Potentially mineralizable nitrogen in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons = 5)	kg/ba				DF	
,	ORGNW	Organic nitrogen content from mirral waste in the plow horizon.	%	.		<u> </u>	DF	
18	TPO	Total phosphorus in each soil horizon. (Number of soil horizons ¹¹ 5)	%		<u> </u>	ļ	DF	
11	CLABO	Labile phosphorus concentration in each soil borizon. (Number of soil borizons ~ 5)	ug/g	20	20	25	CAL	CLAB input values are the same for all soil horizons. Labile phosphorus input values were manually modified during the calibration process.
12	ORGPW	Organic P content from animal waste in plow horizon.	*	ļ	ļ	ļ	DF	
13	PDATE	Dute that the following parameters are valid, year of the crop rotation cycle and Julian day.	No Units	1001	1001	1001	GN	
14	NF	Number of fertilizer and animal waste applications during the update period.	No Units	ļ	ļ	ļ	D#	
14	NTIL	Number of tillage operations during the update period.	No Units	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ļ	DF	
14	DHRVST	Date of crop hervest, year of the crop rotation cycle and Julius day.	No Units				DF	
15	ICROP	Identification number of the crop grown during this cropping period.	No Units	69	69	69	GN	Trees-conifer is the crop type specified.
15	LEG	Code for legame orop.	No Units	 	_		DF	
15	PY	Potential yield for the harvestable portion of the crop.	kg/ha	ļ	<u> </u>	ļ	DF	
15	DMY	Dry matter ratio, the ratio of total dry matter production to harvestable portion of the crop.	No Units		1		DF	
15	CNR	Carbon nitrogen estio for the crop.	No Units	1			DF	
15	RNP	Ratio of crop retroges to phosphorus.	No Units	I		1	ÐF	
15	CI	Coefficient in the exponential relation to estimate nitrogen coastest of the crop.	No Units			l	DF	
15	CZ	Exponent in the exponential relation to estimate uitrogen content of the crop.	No Units				DF	
16	DF	Date of Sertilizer application, year of the crop rotation and Julian day.	149 018				N/A	
16	MFERT	Code for method of fartilization.	No Units	ļ	_		NA.	<u> </u>
16	METRAP		No Units	+	+		NA NA	<u> </u>
16	MIYPE	Code for animal waste type. Festilizer nimate.	No Units kg/ha	+	 	+	NA NA	
17	FNH	Fertilizer ananonia.	kg/ha	 	1	 	NA NA	
17	FP	Fertilizer phosphorus	kg/tm		1		NA NA	
17	DEPIN	Dopth of incorporation.	CEB	1	T	L	NA.	
17	FRIWAT		em	1			NA	
18	RATE	Application rate for snime veste.	tn/hs	1	1	_	NA.	
18	DEPIN	Depth of incorporation.	cm	+			NA NA	<u> </u>
18	ATN	Total sittoger in animal waste.	*	4	-	+	NA NA	
18	APORGN		**	+	+	+	NA NA	
18 18	APHOS	Ammonia content in assimal waste. Total phosphorus content in assimal waste.	1%	 	+	 	NA NA	
	,		- %	+	+	+	NA NA	
18	APORGP AOM	Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic matter content in animal waste.	1 %	 	+	 	NA NA	
18	WASTYP		No Units	1	1	1	NA	
19	NTDAY	Date of tillage, year of crop rotation cycle and Julian day.	No Units	1			NA.	
19	LTIL	Code to designate the tillage implement or equipment used	L No Units				NA	
19	DTIL	Dopth of tillage.	cm.				NA NA	
19	EFFINC	Efficiency of incorporation of surface residue.	No Units				NA NA	
19	FMIX	Tillage mixing efficiency	No Units	Ц		ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	N/A	<u></u>

se:

Application specific parameter value applied to set simulation time periods, output preferences, and parameter codes for particular method applications (e.g., method of fertilization).

(I/EAMS default parameter value applied.

Calibrated parameter value applied.

Calibrated parameter value applied.

Calibrated parameter value applied.

Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizer application would not be required if a particular land use or field is not fertilized.

Site-specific parameter value applied.

AS DF CAL GN NA

Dr. Engel's Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Urban Land Use Table B-8.

Someries of Information:

) (GLEMS posimises who whose were extracted from the 1N* PAR files located in the ILLINOIS. BARRONFORT, and CANETCREEK sub-folders
in the following directory: "N-URWLAW I Expert Reports Engel Materials Chemia Finals 1.1 FUTURE_1007Rs"

) Kinsel, W.G. and Duris, F.M. 2000. GLAMS Groundwater Locating Effects of Agricultural Management Systems), Version 3.0. User Manual. Pub. No. SEWEL-WGKFMD-050199.

3) "Expert Report Fefer to "Poultry Wester Generation and Load Application in the Whose New Windowski and of Pusphorus Loude to the Illinois River Waterials Mirrows and Rivers and
Lade Tendeller, Expert Report of Dr. B. Engel, For State of Oklahoma. In Case No. 05-CU-329-GKF-SAL, State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al. (In the United States District Court for the

Northern District of Oblahoma), Dr. B. Engel, P.E. Professor of Agricultural and Biological Engineering, May 22, 2008*
4) E-mail correspondence on Winthesday, August 13, 2008 8:27 AM; From David Page, To Robert George, Londa Bullock, David Riggs, Elizabeth Claire Xidis;

Subject, RE: Follow Up Items from July 11 Teleconference with Dr. Engel.

Plant Nutrient Parameter Input File for Urban Land Use (INU.PAR)

	Parameter	Parameter			Parameter Value		Source of	
Cord#	Name	Description	U.	Illinois	Baron	Caney	Parameter Value	Comment
				River	Part.	Creek		
		Three 80-character lines of alphanameric information that identifies the particular computer run. For example, the soil						The run description does not provide my information regarding the site-specific
1.5	TITLE	type, the crop rotation, the tilinge practices, may be unofal	No Units		l		GN	application to the IRW. The run description is a generic description that was taken from
		in identifying						an example input file on p. 189 of the GLEAMS treer manual.
	NBYR	the file and specific GLEAMS application.	Year	1901	1901	1901	A5	
- 1	NEYR	Beginning year of plant natrient simulation. Ending year of plant natrient simulation.	Year	2000	2000	2000	AS	
	NUTOUT	Code to designate level of printed national output.	No Units	2	2	2	AS	
	FLGROT	Number of years in a crop rotation cycle.	No Usits	ı	I	I	AS	
-	PLGAAL	Code for output of N and P balance at the end each year of	No Units	0	0	0	A5	
	11201210	riculation.						
5	RESDW	Crop residue on the ground serface when simulation begins.	kg/ha				DF	
5	RCN	Nitrogen concentration in minfall.	taben				DF	
5	CNI	Concentration of nitrate-nitrogen is irrigation.	ppno				DF	
5	CH	Concestration of labile-phosphorus in irrigation.	ppen				DF	
6	ING	Total nitrogen in each soil horizon.	%				D¥F	
	 	(Number of soil horizons = 5) Nitrate-nitrages concentration in each soil horizon.						
7	CNTTO	(Number of soil horizons = 5)	a6∖8				DF	
***************************************	1	Potentially mineralizable sitrogen in each soil besizen.						
	POTMNO	(Number of soil horizons = 5)	kg/hn				DF	
	 	Organic astrogen content from animal waste in the plow						
,	ORGNW	horizon.	%			<u> </u>	DF	
10	1799	Total phosphores in each soil horizon.	%				DF	
	170	(Nausbor of soil boxizona~ 5)					ļ	
11	CLABO	Labile phosphorus concentration is each soil horizon.	11g/g			l	DF	
11	CLARU	(Number of soil horizons < 5)	146.8				"	
12	ORGPW	Organic P content from animal waste in plow horizon.	**			·	TYF	
12	ORGEN	Organice P content troin animic waste or prow sortzon.	_ ~				<u> </u>	
15	PRATE	Date that the following parameters are valid, year of the	No Units	1001	1001	1001	GN	
		ezop rotation cycle and Julius day.						
14	NF	Number of fortilizer and animal waste applications during	No Units	0	0	0	GN	
	 	the update period.	 			 	-	<u> </u>
14	NTIL	Number of tillage operations during the update period.	No Units	0	0	0	GN	
	†	Date of crop harvest, year of the crop rotation cycle and				10366	AS	
14	DHRVST	Julian day.	No Units	10366	10366	10366	AS	
15	KCROP	Identification number of the crop grown during this	No Units	2	2	2	AS	Alfalfa-lay is the crop type specified:
		cropping period.	L			<u></u>		Total and the stop type appearance
15	1.EG	Code for legence crop.	No Units	ļ	ļ	 	ÐF	
15	PT	Potential yield for the hervesteble portion of the crop.	kg/he			1	DF	
	T	Dry metter ratio, the ratio of total dry metter production to	No Units				DF	†
15	DMY	hervostable portion of the srop.						
15	CNR	Carbon:sitroges ratio for the crop.	No Units	ļ		 	Dif	
15	RNP	Ratio of crop nitrages to phosphorus. Coefficient in the exponential relation to estimate nitrogen	No Units	 	 	 	DF	
15	CI	content of the crop.	No Units	l	l		Đ₩	
75	C2	Exponent is the exponential relation to estimate nitrogen	No Unite	†	†		DF	
- 13	1 42	content of the crop.	No Omes	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	
16	DF	Date of fertilizer application, your of the crop rotation and	No Units		l	İ	NA	
16	MEERT	Julium day. Code for method of fortilization.	No Units		 	 	NA.	
16	METHAP		No Units	 		t	NA	
16	MTTPE	Code for animal waste type.	No Units				NA	
17	IN	Fortilizer uitrate.	ky/ha			I	NA	
			kg/he	ļ			NA NA	_
17	FNII	Fertilizar anatornia.					ł NA	
17	FP	Fortilizer phosphores.	kg/be	 		 		
17 17	FP DEMN	Fortifizer phosphores. Depth of isoorporation.	kg/se can				NA.	
17 17 17	FP DEPIN FRIWAT	Fertilizer phosphores. Depth of incorporation. Depth of water applied for fortigation.	kg/be can css				NA NA	
17 17	FP DEMN	Fortifizer phosphores. Depth of incorporation. Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste.	kg/se can				NA.	
17 17 17 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE	Forbliser phosphores. Dopth of moorporation. Dopth of wiser applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Dopth of incorporation. Total nitrogen is animal waster.	kg/ten carr css ts/tes cas				NA NA NA NA	
17 17 17 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN APORGN	Fortifizer phosphores. Depth of moorporation. Depth of when registed for fortigetine. Application rate for autitud weste. Depth of incorporation. Total airrogen is assired waste. Organic natrogen correct is animal waste.	kg/ten can can cas ms/ten cas %				NA NA NA NA NA	
17 17 17 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN	Forbliser phosphores. Dopth of moorporation. Dopth of wiser applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Dopth of incorporation. Total nitrogen is animal waster.	kg/ten carr css ts/tes cas				NA NA NA NA	
17 17 17 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN APORGN	Fortifizer phosphores. Depth of moorporation. Depth of when registed for fortigetine. Application rate for autitud weste. Depth of incorporation. Total airrogen is assired waste. Organic natrogen correct is animal waste.	kg/ten can can cas ms/ten cas %				NA NA NA NA NA	
17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN ATN APORGN ANH APBOS	Fortilizer phosphores Depth of incorporation Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of successory animal weste. Total airropes in animal waste. Organic nitrogen content in animal waste. Ammonia content is estimal waste. Total phosphories content in actrand waste.	kg/fise care css mu/fise css % 44 46				NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	
17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN APORGN ANH APPROS	Forbifser phosphores. Doph of incorporation. Doph of wieer agained for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Doph of incorporation. Total airrogen in animal waste. Organic nitrogen context in animal waste. Aminosis context in animal waste. Total phosphorus context in actual veste. Organic phosphorus context in actual weste. Organic phosphorus context in actual weste.	kg/fine care care care care care care so/fine care so/fine care so/fine sore sore sore sore sore sore sore sor				NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	
17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN ATN APORGN ANH APPROS APORGP AOM	Fortilizer phosphoras Depth of morproration Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of some properties. Total aritropae in animal waste. Organic nitrogen content in animal waste. Ammonia content in estimal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic nativer occutent in animal waste.	kg/fise care css mu/fise css % 44 46				NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	
17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	FP DEFIN FRIWAT FRIWAT FRIWAT ATE DEFIN AIN APORGN ANH APHOS APORGP AOM WASTYP	Fortilizer phosphores Depth of moorporation Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of moorporation. Total airropes in animal waste. Organic nitropes content in animal waste. Ammooris content in animal waste. Total phosphoris content in animal waste. Organic native content in animal waste. Organic phosphores content in animal waste. Organic phosphores content in animal waste. Organic matter contents in minimal waste.	kg/bs can can can can can can sa-ths can				NA N	
17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN ATN APORGN ANH APPROS APORGP AOM	Fortilizer phosphoras Depth of morproration Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of some properties. Total aritropae in animal waste. Organic nitrogen content in animal waste. Ammonia content in estimal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic nativer occutent in animal waste.	kg/bs can ca				NA N	
17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN APORGN ANH APPOS APPOS APONGP AOM WASTYP NTDAY	Fortilizer phosphoras Depth of morporation Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of morporation Depth of anomal weste. Depth of anomal weste. Total nitrogen in animal waste. Ammonia content in animal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic natter content in animal weste. Organic matter content in animal weste. Type of animal waste (e.g., solid, shurry, or liquid). Date of hillage, year of crop rotation cycle and Jalian day.	kg/ha can can can can can hyb can hyb hy hy h h h No Unita				NA N	
17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19	FP DEFIN FRIVAT RATE DEFIN AIN AIN AFORGN ANH AFFOS AFORGP AOM WASTIP NTDAY	Fortilizer phosphoras Depth of morporation Depth of water against fire fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of comparison of the fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of incorporation. Total airrogen is animal waste. Organic nitrogen content is animal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic matter content is mixed waste. Type of saimal waste (e.g., solid, aburry, or liquid). Dete of tillage, year of crop rotation cycle and Jahan day. Code to designate the tillage implement or cquiptreent used.	leg/be can can can to-be cots % % % % % % % % No Units No Units				NA N	
17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19	FP DEPIN FRIWAT RATE DEPIN AIN APORGN ANH APPOS APPOS APORGP AOM WASTYP NTDAY	Fortilizer phosphoras Depth of morporation Depth of water applied for fortigation. Application rate for animal weste. Depth of morporation Depth of anomal weste. Depth of anomal weste. Total nitrogen in animal waste. Ammonia content in animal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Total phosphorus content in animal waste. Organic phosphorus content in animal weste. Organic matter content in animal weste. Type of animal weste (e.g., solid, shurry, or liquid). Date of hillage, year of crop rotation cycle and Jalian day.	kg/ha can can can can can hyb can hyb hy hy h h h No Unita				NA N	

Applications specific parameter value applied to sot simulation time periods, output proferences, and parameter codes for perticular method applications (e.g., method of GLEAMS default parameter value applied.

Cultivated parameter value applied.

Cultivated parameter value applied in GLEAMS user manual applied unless noted otherwise.

Not applicable. Parameter input value may not be required if certain model attributes are not selected. For example, parameter inputs required for fertilizer application would not be required if a perticular and use or field is not fertilized.

Site-specific persameter value applied. sot simulation time periods, output proferences, and parameter codes for perticular method applications (e.g., method of fertilization).